

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Stephen S Edwards,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Maricopa County Superior Court, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-25-02296-PHX-KML

ORDER

15 Plaintiff Stephen S. Edwards is attempting to sue the Maricopa County Superior
16 Court, Lakewood Community Association, the United States Department of Justice, and
17 former Maricopa County Sheriff Paul Penzone.¹ The court may sua sponte dismiss a
18 complaint when it “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*,
19 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Edwards’s complaint is dismissed.

20 Edwards appears to be suing over a dispute with his homeowners association—
21 Lakewood Community Association—that led to proceedings in state court. Dissatisfied
22 with the outcome in state court, Edwards filed this suit alleging the Maricopa County
23 Superior Court has “[a] deficient pattern of depravation” and the rulings against him were
24 a “Hate Crime.” (Doc. 1 at 3, 7.) Edwards further alleges Lakewood is “RACIST Morally,

25 ¹ This is Edwards’s twenty-fourth lawsuit in this court. After some of his suits were
26 dismissed, Edwards attempted to sue the judges who had ruled against him. *See* No. CV-
27 17-4661. In 2019, a district judge declared Edwards a vexatious litigant and prohibited him
28 from filing any additional suits against particular defendants. *Edwards v. PHH Mortg.*
Corp., No. CV-18-04040-PHX-SPL, 2019 WL 1950304, at *5 (D. Ariz. Apr. 30, 2019),
aff’d, 808 F. App’x 517 (9th Cir. 2020). Also in 2019, the Maricopa County Superior Court
declared Edwards a vexatious litigant and prohibited him from filing any new suit “without
leave of the Civil Presiding Judge or his/her designee.” (Doc. 1 at 23.)

1 Legally bankrupt,” apparently as evidenced through Lakewood’s actions in the state court
2 proceedings. (Doc. 1 at 2.) Edwards names the Department of Justice as a defendant
3 because he believes “[t]he Services of the DOJ should be referred to investigate the
4 allegations of a hate crime.” (Doc. 1 at 7.) And Edwards names Penzone because the
5 Sheriff’s Office’s “Foreclosure process” “depraves [sic] the HOA Foreclosure Victim and
6 further victimizes the homeowner.” (Doc. 1 at 3.) These allegations qualify as frivolous.

7 Edwards was informed in one of his prior suits that he could not sue the Maricopa
8 County Superior Court because it is a non-jural entity. *Edwards v. Lakewood Cmty. Ass’n*,
9 No. CV-18-01934-PHX-JJT, 2018 WL 4953263, at *1 (D. Ariz. Oct. 12, 2018). That
10 remains true. Edwards cannot sue the United States Department of Justice absent a waiver
11 of sovereign immunity, and he has not identified any such waiver. *Balser v. Dep’t of Just.,*
12 *Off. of U.S. Tr.*, 327 F.3d 903, 907 (9th Cir. 2003). Edwards’s claims against Lakewood
13 are based only on Lakewood’s pursuit of state-court litigation against Edwards. That is not
14 sufficient to state any plausible claim for relief. And there are no allegations establishing
15 former Sheriff Penzone might be personally liable to Edwards based on the “foreclosure
16 process” the Sheriff’s Office allegedly follows. The complaint is dismissed without leave
17 to amend.

18 **IT IS ORDERED** the complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE**
19 **TO AMEND**. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment a judgment of dismissal without
20 prejudice and close this case.

21 Dated this 7th day of July, 2025.

22
23 
24 _____
25 **Honorable Krissa M. Lanham**
26 **United States District Judge**
27
28